IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 1672 of 2002

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

HINA BOBBIN WORKS

Versus

KANTABEN GANDABHAI

Appearance: MR KM PATEL for the Petitioner.
Mr.Upadhyay for Respondent Nos. 1-13

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

Date of decision: 22/09/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

The petitioner has challenged the order passed by the Labour Court, on 17.5.2000, by which the Labour Court has granted recovery applications filed on behalf of the respondents and the respondents have been awarded stipulated amount as per the order of the Labour Court. Today, Mr.K.M. Patel, learned Advocate for the petitioner, and Mr.Upadhyay, learned Advocate for the respondents, state that the matter is amicably settled

between the parties.

Mr.Upadhyay states that the settlement terms are signed by the concerned workmen and the Union representative has identified such workmen. The learned Advocate of the petitioner is permitted to place on record copy of the consent Pursis.

In view of this development, Mr.Patel, learned Advocate for the petitioner, wants to withdraw this petition. Permission is granted. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of as withdrawn. Rule is discharged. Interim relief is vacated.

The order of the Labour Court is ordered to be substituted accordingly in view of the consent terms.

Mr.Patel states that the concerned workmen will be made necessary payment as per the consent terms at the earliest and, in any case, by 23rd September, 2003.

Mr.Patel also states that proprietor of the firm Mr.Chaturbhai Patel is present, whom Mr.Patel has identified. Mr.Upadhyay states that, on behalf of the Union one Mr.S.B. Parmar is present, whom Mr.Upadhyay has identified.

22nd September, 2003 (P.B. Majmudar, J.)

***

(apj)